



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/677,891

09/30/2003

Baiju D. Mandalia

N0484.70561US00

9670

23628 7590 07/26/2010
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210-2206

EXAMINER

PULLIAS, JESSE SCOTT

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/26/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to correspondence filed 05/25/10 regarding application 10/677891, in which claims 1, 5, 21, and 22 were amended. Claims 1, 5, and 20-23 are pending in the application and have been considered.

Response to Arguments

2. The arguments on pages 5-8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds for rejection.

Specification

3. While not objected to, applicant's non-standard usage of the term "speech profile" in, e.g., paragraph [0022] of the disclosure has been noted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because it is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 21 is directed to "At least one computer readable medium encoded with instructions". The specification is silent as to whether the "medium" is transitory or not, and so given the broadest reasonable interpreted, the claimed "medium" is rejected as

Art Unit: 2626

being directed to a signal, which is non-statutory subject matter. The addition of the term "non-transitory" to "medium" would obviate this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harb et al. (7,149,694) in view of Lohmann, II et al. (5,745,692).

Consider claim 1, Harb discloses a method of administering a plurality of managed systems in a managed network using a voice interface (**Col 4 lines 17-18, Fig 1, voice applications 14, verbal access using a phone**), the method comprising:

storing a system speech profile corresponding to at least one managed system of the plurality of managed systems, wherein the system speech profile specifies which capabilities of the at least one managed system are available on the managed network and which capabilities are to be voice-enabled and made accessible via a telephony interface (**Fig 12, Fig 13, grammar update enable, Col 9 lines 44-50, subscribe for grammar**); and

automatically generating a grammar and a speech dialog for the at least one managed system using the system speech profile (**Col 9 lines 59-64, generating an**

Art Unit: 2626

XSLT based on the UI objects selected to be voice enabled, **Col 17 lines 47-55**, grammar update processing), wherein the speech dialog for the at least one managed system includes at least one audio prompt that is played via a telephone in response to accessing, via the telephony interface, at least one of the voice-enabled capabilities of the at least one managed system (**Col 4 lines 25-34**, TTS prompts with voice application to voice access products).

Harb does not specifically mention wherein the at least one of the voice enabled capabilities comprises at least one administrative function to administer the at least one managed system, and the speech dialog allows the user to administer the at least one managed system by accessing the at least one administrative function via at least one voice command.

Lohmann discloses at least one voice enabled capabilities comprises at least one administrative function to administer the at least one managed system, and a speech dialog allows a user to administer the at least one managed system by accessing the at least one administrative function via at least one voice command (**Abstract**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Harb such that the at least one of the voice enabled capabilities comprises at least one administrative function to administer the at least one managed system, and the speech dialog allows the user to administer the at least one managed system by accessing the at least one administrative function via at least one voice command, in order to increase convenience, as suggested by Lohmann (**Col 1 lines 23-33**).

Consider claim 21, it is directed to at least one computer readable medium encoded with instructions that, when executed on a computer system (**Harb, Fig 22**), perform the method of claim 1, and so is rejected for the same or similar reasons as claim 1.

Consider claim 22, it is directed to a computer system for administering a plurality of managed systems in a managed network comprising:

a telephony interface to the managed network (**Harb, Fig 21** phone network 22);
at least one controller, coupled to the telephony interface (**Fig 21**, e.g. voice app server 510), that performs the method of claim 1, and so is rejected for the same or similar reasons as claim 1.

Consider claim 20, Harb discloses each system speech profile is generated based on specific capabilities of its corresponding managed system (**Fig 13**, the list of entities available for the application is based on which views, applets etc. the administrator would like to provide support for, see **Col 9 lines 44-50**).

Consider claim 23, Harb discloses providing an interface that enables a system administrator to manually edit the automatically generated speech dialog (**Abstract, Fig 13**).

8. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harb et

Art Unit: 2626

al. (7,149,694), in view of in view of Lohmann, II et al. (5,745,692), in further view of Loring et al. (6,195,641).

With respect to claim 5, Harb and Lohmann do not specifically mention adding a new managed system to the managed network including connecting the new managed system to the managed network, detecting the new managed system, and loading a system speech profile for the detected managed system.

Loring discloses adding a new managed system to the managed network (**Col 4 lines 60-61**) including connecting the new managed system to the managed network (**Col 4 lines 61-62**, new client begins a session), detecting the new managed system (**Col 4 lines 61-62**, new client begins a session), and loading a system speech profile for the detected managed system (**Col 4 lines 55-62**, transmitting the user vocabulary profile).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Harb and Lohmann by adding a new managed system to the managed network including connecting the new managed system to the managed network, detecting the new managed system, and loading a system speech profile for the detected managed system, in order to update vocabulary for each system as needed without requiring user interaction, as suggested by Loring (**Col 3 lines 4-6**).

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Art Unit: 2626

examiner should be directed to Jesse Pullias whose telephone number is 571/270-5135. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571/272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571/270-6135.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Jesse S Pullias/
Examiner, Art Unit 2626

/Talivaldis Ivars Smits/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626

7/22/2010